REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been added, amended, or canceled.

Claims 1-50 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,026,293 to Osborn ("Osborn"). Osborn is directed to a protection mechanism that provides access control to capabilities of reprogramming software in a device. A public key cryptography scheme is used to avoid the need for storage of secret keys or passwords. A data transfer device may be interfaced with the device for memory access of the device. Prior to the memory access, a process to authenticate the data transfer device is initiated.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for providing control to access to a desired function in a system that includes a plurality of functions. Each of the plurality of functions has a corresponding key associated therewith. In the method of claim 1, *inter alia*, the key corresponding to the desired function is selected, an authentication process that includes using the selected key is conducted, and access to the desired function is controlled according to a result of the authentication process.

Applicant respectfully submits that Osborn fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of claim 1. In particular, in contrast to claim 1, Osborn fails to teach or suggest a system that includes a plurality of functions in which each of the plurality of functions has a corresponding key associated therewith. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 distinguishes over Osborn for similar reasons to those outlined above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 21 is directed to a method for providing controlled access to a desired function in a system that includes one or more functions. In the method of claim 21, a first authentication process is conducted with an external entity. The first authentication process includes using a first key corresponding to the desired function. A second authentication process is conducted. The second authentication process includes using a second key generated based on a random challenge made by the system to the external entity during the first authentication process. Access to the desired function is controlled according to a result of the first and second authentication processes.

2

Applicant respectfully submits that Osborn fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of claim 21. In particular, in contrast to independent claim 21, Osborn fails to teach or suggest conducting a second authentication process using a second key generated based on a random challenge made during a first authentication process. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 45 distinguishes over Osborn for similar reasons to those stated above with respect to independent claim 21.

In addition to the above, Applicant respectfully submits that Osborn fails to teach or suggest at least one of the distinguishing features of dependent claim 12. Claim 12 includes the feature of encrypting and decrypting data sent between an entity and a system using a session key. In contrast to claim 12, Osborn describes the use of public-key RSA-based cryptography in general and the Fiat-Shamir scheme and an identification/authentication scheme that does not result in an encrypted connection between the communicating entities. In Osborn, a transfer device has a private key corresponding to a public key stored in a system; however, there is no teaching in Osborn of encrypting and decrypting data sent between an entity and a system using a session key. Moreover, Osborn does not teach use of a session key as in claim 12; rather, in Osborn, a key pair used for authentication is also used directly for encryption. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 28 distinguishes over Osborn for similar reasons to those stated above with respect to claim 12.

All remaining claims depend from and further limit one or more claims that are deemed by Applicant to be in allowable form. Applicant therefore respectfully submits that all claims are in allowable form and respectfully requests that the rejection thereof be withdrawn.

3

   In view of the above, each of the presently-pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: January 6, 2005   Respectfully submitted,

                                          By _____
                                          Ross T. Robinson
                                             Registration No.: 47,031
                                          JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
                                             CORPORATION
                                          1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200
                                          Dallas, Texas 75202
                                          (214) 855-4500
                                          Attorneys For Applicant

4